UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,590	10/27/2000	Judith Fitzpatrick	018792/0177	3507

7590 09/04/2002

Michele M Schafer
Foley & Lardner
3000 K Street NW
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007-5109

EXAMINER
TURNER, SHARON L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

DATE MAILED: 09/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/697,590	FITZPATRICK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sharon L. Turner	1647	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cov r sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-53 are pending.

Improper Markush

Prior to setting forth the restriction requirement, it is pointed out that applicants have presented instant claims in improper Markush format, see Ex parte Markush, 1925 C.D. 126, In re Weber, 198 USPQ 334 and MPEP 803.02 and 806.04. The claims are improperly set forth as the genus claims encompassing multiple products, as identified and claimed, fail to share the characteristics of a genus, i.e., a common utility and a substantial structural feature essential to the disclosed utility. Alternatively, the claims define multiple structurally distinct compounds capable of different use, with different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. A reference against one of the claimed product or processes would not be a reference against the other. Therefore, the restriction will be set forth for each of the various groups, irrespective of the improper format of the claims, because the claims define inventions which are not a proper genus or species.

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-10 and 23-25 in part drawn to peptides and peptide compositions, classified for example in class 530, subclass 300.

II. Claims 11-19 in part drawn to a nucleic acids and compositions, classified for example in class 536, subclass 23.1.

III. Claims 20-22 in part drawn to antibodies, classified for example in class 530, subclass 387.1.

IV. Claims 26-28 in part drawn to a method of purifying NTP, classified for example in class 435, subclass 6.

V. Claims 29-34 in part drawn to a diagnostic test for Alzheimer's, classified for example in class 435, subclass 183.

VI. Claims 35-37 in part drawn to a method of using a peptide as an analogue in a therapeutic, classified for example in class 514, subclass 2.

VII. Claims 35-37 in part drawn to a method of using a peptide as an analogue in a diagnostic assay, classified for example in class 435, subclass 7.1.

VIII. Claims 38-40 in part drawn to a method of using a peptide as a trap material in a therapeutic, classified for example in class 424, subclass 94.1.

IX. Claims 38-40 in part drawn to a method of using a peptide as a trap material in a diagnostic assay, classified for example in class 435, subclass 7.1.

X. Claims 41-52 in part drawn to a method of isolating immunoglobulins, classified for example in class 435, subclass 7.1.

XI. Claims 53 in part drawn to a method for preventing NTP interacting through Harlil domains to the extent of using Harlil peptides or peptide mimetics, classified for example in class 436, subclass 500.

XII. Claims 53 in part drawn to a method for preventing NTP interacting through Harlil domains to the extent of using antibodies, classified for example in class 530, subclass 387.1.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-III are related as products. The products are distinct each from the other as the products are comprised of divergent structure are capable of different effects and functions, for example nucleic acids, peptides and antibodies.

Inventions IV-XII are related as processes. The processes are distinct each from the other as the processes differ in reagents, steps, functions, outcomes and effects.

Inventions I and IV-XII and II and XI-XII are related as products and processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the processes for using the peptides and antibodies can be practiced with alternative peptides and antibodies as claimed and the products as claimed can be used alternatively in a method of treatment, a method of making antibodies, a method of screening compounds, and a method for detecting compositions.

Furthermore, in addition to the election of one of the above XII groups, further restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 as set forth below to delineate the molecular embodiments to which the claims will be restricted in accordance with the elected group:

A) A single designated peptide selected from peptides a)-s) as claimed in claim1, SEQ ID NO:2, residues 91-94 and SEQ ID NO's:4-12, respectively.
B) Nucleic acids encoding a single designated peptide selected from peptides a)-s) as claimed claim1, SEQ ID NO:2, residues 91-94 and SEQ ID NO's:4-12, respectively.
C) An antibody which specifically recognizes a single peptide selected from peptides a)-s) as claimed in claim1, SEQ ID NO:2, residues 91-94 and SEQ ID NO's:4-12.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in MPEP 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to

be proper because the peptides, nucleic acids and antibodies indicated constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Each of the polynucleotides, antibodies and polypeptides has unique structural features which require a unique search of the prior art. The inventions indicated differ in structure and function as they are composed of divergent nucleic and amino acids and are differentially able to hybridize, bind or mediate bological functions. A reference to one element would not constitute a reference to another. In addition, searching all of the molecules in a single patent application would provide an undue search burden on the examiner and the USPTO's resources because the indicated searches are not co-extensive.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for any Group is not required for any other Group, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143). In order to be fully responsive, Applicant is required to elect a single group from designated groups I-XII and a single molecular embodiment for each of designated groups A-C to which the claims will be restricted, even though the requirement is traversed. Applicant is

advised that neither I-XII nor A-C are species election requirements; rather each of I-XII and A-C are restriction requirements. The subject matter for examination will be restricted to the extent of the subject matter of the elected groups. It is noted that while one of A-C may not be applicable to one of I-XII, applicant must elect one of each in order to be fully compliant.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this general application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers relating to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600, Group 1640 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Should applicant wish to FAX a response, the current FAX number for Group 1600 is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-0056. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached at (703) 308-4623.

Sharon L. Turner, Ph.D.
8/30/02